

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for her Office Action. The claims presently outstanding are Claims 6-10.

Art Rejections

The art rejections are all respectfully traversed.

Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 6-10 stand rejected under 35 USC Section 102(b) as being anticipated by *Waldenstrom et al.*

The claim language of Claim 6 is not met. Specifically, Claim 6 recites "**without a transition layer or adherent material**". *Waldenstrom et al.* does not disclose an outer layer attached to the carbide component without the use of a transition layer or adherent material. To the contrary, *Waldenstrom et al.* states:

*The content of catalyst metal in the diamond layer may be controlled either by coating the button **before applying the diamond layer** with a thin layer of, e.g., TiN by CVD- or PVD-methods or by using thin foils such as Mo as disclosed in U.S. Pat. No. 4,764,434. (column 4, line 65 – column 5, line 1) (emphasis added).*

Therefore, in *Waldenstrom et al.*, "*the diamond layer is bonded to a support body ... **by means of a thin layer of a refractory material applied by PVD or CVD technique***" (column 1, lines 49-52) (emphasis added).

According to the Federal Circuit:

For a prior art reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim with sufficient clarity to prove

its existence in the prior art.

Motorola, Inc., v. Interdigital Tech. Corp., 43 USPQ 2d 1481, 1490 (Fed. Cir. 1997). As discussed above, *Waldenstrom et al.* does not disclose a method for providing an ultrahard outer layer without the use of a transition layer or adherent material. Therefore, a prima facie case of anticipation has not been established by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Dependent Claims 7-10 depend directly from independent Claim 6 and incorporate all the limitations thereof. Thus, for the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Thus, all grounds of rejection and/or objection are traversed or accommodated, and favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to telephone Robert Groover or the undersigned attorney for an interview to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,



N. Elizabeth Pham, Reg.No. 49,042
Attorney for Applicant

11330 Valley Dale Drive, Dallas TX 75230

214-363-3038

groover@technopatents.com

July 21, 2003